

**NORTHWEST REVIEW**

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY  
TUESDAY  
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL  
AUTHORITY.  
**AT WINNIPEG, MAN.**

Subscription, - - - - \$2.00 a year.  
Six months, - - - - \$1.00.

The NORTHWEST REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & Co., Booksellers, 364 Main St., and G. R. Vendome, Stationer, 300 Main St., opposite Manitoba Hotel.

**ADVERTISING RATES.**

Made known on application.  
Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing.  
Advertisements unaccompanied by Specific instructions inserted until ordered out.

**AGENTS WANTED.**

Agents wanted, in town and country places of Manitoba and the Northwest, who shall solicit and collect subscriptions for the NORTHWEST REVIEW. Very liberal terms made known on application to the Publisher.

Address all Communications to the NORTHWEST REVIEW, Winnipeg, Man.

*Northwest Review.*

TUESDAY, APRIL 20 1897.

**TERMS OF OUR SETTLEMENT.**

**THE CATHOLIC PLATFORM**

- 1 Control of our schools.
- 2 Catholic school districts.
- 3 Catholic teachers, duly certificated, but trained in our own training schools as in England.
- 4 Catholic inspectors.
- 5 Catholic readers, our own textbooks of history and descriptive geography, and full liberty to teach religion and comment on religious questions at any time during school hours.
- 6 Our share of school taxes and government grants, and exemption from taxation for other schools.

**Easter Morn.**

BY SARAH FRANCES ASHBURTON.

Swing wide, ye gates of heaven!  
The sad three days are o'er:  
The grave's dark walls are riven,  
Christ dieth nevermore.

Afar on Calvary's mountain  
A cross against the sky  
Tells of the wondrous Fountain  
That never shall run dry.

There' while His blood was flowing,  
Our sins were washed away,  
And Death the seed was sowing  
That blossoms forth to-day.

Ring loud, O bells of Heaven!  
Rejoice, ye sons of men!  
The grave-stone white is riven,  
Uprises Christ again.

Ave Maria.

**CURRENT COMMENT.**

The best test of a liberal education is the acquired habit of writing good speeches. We say advisedly "writing", not "delivering": for the excellence of the delivery supposes certain natural gifts which no education can impart. The highly educated man is he who knows how to marshal his proofs, how to make a beginning and an end, how to cut clean without hacking and hewing. Measured by this supreme test compared to which the mere memory examinations of the new-fangled universities are child's play — most of the graduates of non-Catholic colleges are lamentable failures. A remarkable instance of their incapacity in this respect is, as we pointed out as the time, Manitoba's Attorney General. He is one of the banner graduates of the most pretentious university in the world, and he cannot write a decent speech. His

discourses are illogical, unconvincing, unattractive, utterly barren of high thoughts. And yet he is ever harping on the inferiority of Catholic institutions. Well, here is a graduate of a fairly good French-Canadian college, a college that has no pretensions to call itself the best in the province of Quebec, who has spoken in the Senate of Canada a speech that will live when the Hon. J. D. Cameron will be forgotten. Senator Bernier has made many fine speeches from his seat in the upper house; but this last, which took up almost all the sitting of April 5th, is the finest yet. We first publish a summary of it as telegraphed to the Free Press of this city and then we begin the issue in instalments of the entire discourse. Careless readers may be satisfied with the colorless summary; but readers of the more thoughtful sort will keep their Reviews from week to week until they have read the whole of the Hon. Bernier's masterly defence of our rights. It is the most exhaustive treatment of our position that has appeared so far. Not one of the governmental sophisms but is answered irrefutably. Not a single difficulty but is met with a clear and straightforward solution. Moreover it is the speech of a gentleman, not the coarse deliverance of an arrogant sciolist. Above all it is redolent with the fragrance of true christianity. While reading it, one breathes a dwinner air.

Another very remarkable speech was delivered by the Montreal senator, Sir William Kingston, M. D., who also graduated from a catholic college in what was then Lower Canada more than forty years ago. This "masterly deliverance," of which we find a verbatim report in the True Witness, fairly sparkles with graphic word-painting & pointed illustrations from the speaker's own experience. Referring to the school "settlement," Sir William said: "Do the advisers of the crown who have put the word into His excellency's mouth know its meaning? A settlement is supposed to be something final. It means an adjustment of differences, a reconciliation in which both parties to the adjustment or reconciliation are agreed & are content; yet, by members of the Government in both houses, we are told it is not final. Arrangement is the word I should have preferred, or a *modus vivendi* or a *modus patiendi* rather." This latter suggestion is a very happy hit, considering that the 'settlement' is really a method of exercising the patience of the minority. Later on, the eloquent and eminent physician called it 'an abortion. Elsewhere he deftly linked praise with rebuke when alluding to Sir Oliver Mowat: "When I first learned that the present leader of the Senate had consented—reluctantly, it seemed, at the time—to accept the port folio of justice, I thought: Here is a troublesome question coming up, and there is no man whose abilities as a jurist better fit him to unravel it. All that is necessary for a man of that great legal mind is to exercise his rare gifts in the direction which is their wont, and all injustice to the minority in Manitoba will soon disappear. I must say I do not recognize the work of either his hand, or of his heart, in the so-styled settlement which is before us." Sir William, judging from his own wide experience of the state of feeling among the electors of the province of Quebec, who now realize that they have been cheated by fine promises, foretold "a very serious awakening" that would reveal, in future elections, "a most material change."

Mr. Ewart's opinion, which is now for the first time published in Manitoba, appeared originally in the Montreal Gazette, and later it was translated by "La Presse." It looks very much as much as if all the organs that are more or less at the enemy's service had received secret

instructions not to utter a syllable about this most important legal opinion. Recognizing that, throughout the whole history of the Manitoba case, our resourceful counsel has been continually unanswerable and unanswered, feeling moreover that this document in particular was quite beyond their ability to reple, they have determined to kill it by saying nothing about it. But we believe in the saying of Esdras: "Great is truth and it prevails." No intelligent person can fail to see how completely Mr. Ewart refutes his quondam colleague, while handling him with kid gloves. The quotations from Mr. Dalton McCarthy and Sir Oliver Mowat are particularly crushing, and the practical hints as to how the "sinews of war" might be provided make the document as exhaustive as it is convincing.

**Hon. Senator Bernier's GREAT SPEECH**

as reported in THE SENATE DEBATES.

Resuming the futher adjourned debate on the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech, on the opening of the second session of the eighth parliament.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER said—In welcoming our presence here at the opening of the session His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to express his gratification at the evidences which prevail through the Dominion of the loyalty and affection entertained by the Canadian people for Her Majesty. It will be my duty, in the course of my remarks, to question the accuracy of some other statements contained in the Speech from the Throne, as well as the wisdom of the course taken by the Government in connection with certain matters. But in so far as this expression of gratification is concerned, no one in this Dominion concurs more sincerely than I do in such gratification. The loyalty of the Canadian people for Her Majesty, irrespective of creed, origin or class, is as strong and as full of affection as that of the people living along the banks of the Thames.

And the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of our Gracious Queen is a suitable occasion for her loyal subjects to give expression to their feelings of joy and pride, and also to the good wishes they are all so happy to send across the ocean to Her Majesty and to the royal family. Her Majesty has adorned the Throne for the last sixty years. During her long and glorious reign the possessions of the British Empire have been enlarged to a remarkable extent; civil liberty and self government have steadily grown all over the immense domain over which she rules; the colonies have been brought more in touch with the heart of the empire. It is under this eventful reign that Canada has reached its present area, its prominent position in the world and its prosperity. The illustrious events of Her Majesty's reign are the glory of our own country, and we heartily join with His Excellency and his government in the congratulations which such a commemoration as the Diamond Jubilee must prompt in every hamlet of this Dominion. There are, however, some clouds travelling across that otherwise bright sky. In a distant part of the empire physical suffering in its most woeful form has befallen thousands and thousands of our fellow subjects, and a widespread sympathy has responded to the appeals of these unfortunate people whose distress is so lamentable. But closer to us, and even within our own borders, there is also a large portion of the loyal subjects of Her Majesty who are now enduring civil and moral disabilities of the gravest nature. And while the sympathies of the government rightfully go to the former, they do not seem to have, I regret to say, the slightest regard for the latter.

While the sun of liberty is shining all over the rest of the empire, religious liberty—which overtops all the liberties our modern times claim to have conquered—religious liberty is denied to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. Indeed, there is no religious liberty when the parents are forced to educate their children contrary to their own religious views. This contention is put forth by others as well as by Catholics. Sir A. T. Galt, one of the fathers of our constitution, said one day:

There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated contrary to their own religious belief.

Mr. Gladstone has said also:

In my opinion an undenominational system of religion framed by or under the authority of the state is a monster.

Lord Salisbury expressed himself in the following way:

Numbers of persons have invented what I call a patent compressible religion which can be forced into all consciences with a little squeezing, and they wish to insist that this should be the only religion taught throughout the schools of the nation.\* \* \* \*

There is only one sound principle in religious education to which you should cling, which you should relentlessly enforce against all the conveniences and experiences of official men, and that is that a parent unless he has forfeited the right by criminal acts, has the inalienable right to determine the teaching the child shall receive upon the holiest and most momentous of subjects.

I need not furnish any other quotations to show that the Catholics are not alone in their contention. It is shared by most illustrious statesmen of different creeds, and hence any charge made against the Catholics for holding such views, must fall alike upon these statesmen who stand amongst the greatest of modern times. In support of the opposite views, some advocate the right of a state to educate the people. On this point also I shall quote an authority which is not a Catholic one, but which, however, coincides with the Catholic doctrine. John Stuart Mill, an advanced Liberal, says in his Essay on Liberty:

That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in state hands I go as far as any one in deprecating. It is not endurable that a government should, either in law or in fact, have complete control over the education of the people.

Then on this point also the Catholic views are shared by distinguished thinkers, and the minority cannot be accused of holding views entirely at variance with those of modern times. What has been the policy pursued in England? From the year 1870 onward school legislation has been on the basis of denominational schools, and this year that legislation has been further amended in a way which brings it more fully within these lines, and pledges are given that in the near future denominational schools will be given the same privileges as the board schools. I have not the presumption to suppose that I can convince everybody that my views are better than theirs; but I may say this—in the presence of the opinions I have quoted, in the presence of the policy of the successive governments which have held power in England for the last forty years, are not those who differ in opinion from me disposed to concede at least that after all the Catholic views, shared as they are by the most illustrious statesmen and thinkers in Protestant England, are not to be looked upon as quite unreasonable? And if so, are not those views entitled to some consideration, particularly when those views are placed under the guarantee of the constitution? If I could bring my fellow citizens to that point, I am sure that justice would soon prevail; because their good sense, their fairness, their generosity, would then mediate and advise them, for the sake of peace and harmony, to accept a condition of things,

which looked at as a pure matter of policy, commends itself to such men as Gladstone, Lord Salisbury and others, while it is demanded by their Catholic fellow-citizens in Canada as a matter of conscience. It must be remembered here at once that religious belief cannot be decided by yeas and nays, that it is not a matter in which the law of give and take can work. We are, in this Canada of ours in round numbers, five millions of people, of whom two millions are Catholics and three million belonging to other denominations. The two millions cannot surely dominate the three millions, but on the other hand the three millions would certainly be in the most serious error if they believed that they might finally drive out the two millions. We are bound to live close together in this land; this is a hard fact. What are we to do then? Is it not our respective duty to live in peace and work hand in hand for the development of our resources and the prosperity of our country?

(To be continued.)

**Summary of Sen. Bernier's Speech.**

Free Press Special, April, 5th.

In the Senate this afternoon Senator Bernier continued the debate on the address. He spoke for over two hours and devoted most of the time to an exhaustive and careful review of the school question, from the standpoint of a representative of the minority in Manitoba. From a constitutional standpoint he maintained that the judgment of the privy council on the school question admitted no compromise. He quoted from the judgment to show that the privileges of which the minority had been deprived were clearly stated; that it was declared that a wrong had been suffered by the minority, and that power was vested in the governor-general-in-council to hear an appeal and remedy that wrong. It was an admitted principle in constitutional law that where a wrong existed and a remedy was vested in a duly constituted power to remedy, there was a corresponding duty on that power to exercise the remedy to the fullest extent. The full measure of the judgment ordered that the denominational schools of the minority should be restored. So long as the judgment remained unsatisfied they were suffering an injustice. The terms of the judgment, he admitted, did not order the re-enactment of the legislation repealed by the school acts of 1890 but it did order the re-establishment of denominational schools. The judgment in the exact words of the memorial presented by the minority, stated that a remedy could be applied by so amending the local acts as to restore the rights and privileges taken away by that legislation. That was what the minority asked for and that was what the remedial order passed by the governor-general-in-council proposed to do. The attitude of the present government was in most flagrant disregard of the principles of constitutional government. The minority had not abated one iota of its just claims, but occupied the same dignified position as it had always done. In the so-called settlement it had not even been consulted, nay, more, it had been insulted at its very doors by a minister of the crown. The sweet flattering tone of the premier could never atone for that insult. The present government was acting in as unconstitutional a manner as the Manitoba government had acted in passing the acts of 1890. The Manitoba government had treated the minority in a cruel manner in enacting legislation without the slightest regard to the rights of the minority. It had broken its pledges, given on the public platforms during the local elections, that the schools of the minority would not be disturbed. In view of these facts he could not agree